

Issues Raised in the Office Communication

The Examiner has stated that the reply to Office Action filed on April 19, 2006 by the Applicant was not fully responsive to the Office Action dated October 19, 2005 because the reply did not address the objection to the drawings set forth in that Office Action. In the previous Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings indicating that the application admits of illustration by a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the statement in the specification that “a preferred embodiment of the instant invention is described, in part, with reference to Figures 1 and 2 showing the display and the storage system of the prior art” does not clearly distinguish the elements of the instant invention from the admitted prior art. On page 4 of the previous Office Action response, the Applicant amended the specification to more clearly state the differences in the prior art depicted in Figures 1-3 and the present invention depicted in Figures 4-9. Applicant believes that this amendment satisfies the Examiner’s objections to the drawings.

In the prior art, the picture is assembled on to a page with little customization except using a personal image and lettering. The entire assembled sheet is then slipped inside a pocket attached to the front cover of the album. The present invention, however, is an assembly system that has additional customizable options, such as color and thickness which slips inside the pocket of the album in the same manner as the page of the prior art. The present invention is the entire assembly of mat, images, lettering and other items in a layered way replacing the sheet of the prior art. A person

INVENTOR: SEYMOUR et al.
Serial No. 10/764,977

skilled in the art will be able to differentiate between the prior art and the present invention.

INVENTOR: SEYMOUR et al.
Serial No. 10/764,977

Reconsideration of the application respectfully is requested. The foregoing remarks are believed to be responsive to every matter raised in the office action. If, however, some matter has been overlooked, an opportunity to correct the oversight would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Bryan P. Stanley
Patent Office Reg. No. 44,352
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
PO Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station
Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone: (816) 460-2410
Facsimile: (816) 531-7545

Attorneys for Applicant